

REMARKS

Claims 16-36 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 21-27 and 30-36 stand rejected. Claims 16-20, 28, and 29 are objected to. Herein, Claims 16, 18, 21, and 30 have been amended. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response, Claims 16-36 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks, and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 16-20 are objected to because of several informalities in Claims 16 and 18. Herein, Claims 16 and 18 have been amended to correct the informalities. Withdrawal of the objection to Claims 16-20 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) Rejections

Claims 21-27 and 30-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mason et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,817,005 (hereafter Mason). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 21 recites (as amended):

A method of designing a circuit for a programmable device, said method comprising:

selecting a module ***from a plurality of predefined modules*** to be used in said circuit;

requesting a valid placement for said module in a graphical user interface comprising resource images representing programmable resources in said programmable device, said valid placement specifying at least one of said resource images; and

selecting said valid placement to place said module in said graphical user interface. (emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that Mason does not disclose the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 21. In particular, Independent Claim 21 recites the limitation, "selecting a module ***from a plurality of predefined modules*** to be used in said circuit," (emphasis added). In contrast, Mason is directed to determining whether a design should be partitioned into modules (step 101A of Figure 1A), dividing the design into modules if the design would benefit from modular design (step 103 of Figure 1A), and designing any module independently from other modules. [Mason; Figure 1A; Col. 2, lines 1-14; Col. 8, line 57 through Col. 9, line 31]. According to Mason, each module is given

constraints such as a high-level description of what each module should do, what region of the target architecture it should occupy (i.e., a relative physical location with respect to other logic on the chip), and necessary connections to other modules. [Mason; Col. 9, lines 18-31]. That is, Mason is directed to partitioning a design (or circuit) into modules, specifying constraints for the modules, and individually designing each module instead of selecting a module from a plurality of predefined modules to be used in the design (or circuit), as in the invention of Independent Claim 21. Mason fails to disclose predefined modules. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 21 is not anticipated by Mason and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 22-27 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 21, which is allowable over Mason. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 22-27 are patentable over Mason for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claim 30, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 30 recites similar limitations as in Independent Claim 21. In particular, Independent Claim 30 recites the limitation, "selecting a module ***from a plurality of predefined modules*** for placement in said graphical user interface comprising resource images representing programmable resources of said

programmable device", (emphasis added). As stated above, Mason fails to disclose the cited limitation. Therefore, Independent Claim 30 is not anticipated by Mason and is in condition for allowance for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 21.

Dependent Claims 31-36 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 30, which is allowable over Mason. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 31-36 are patentable over Mason for the reasons discussed above.

Allowable Subject Matter

It was stated that Claims 16-20 are allowable. Moreover, the objection to Claims 16-20 has been addressed by amending Claims 16 and 18 to correct informalities.

Claims 28 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Dependent Claims 28 and 29 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 21, which is allowable over Mason. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 28 and 29 are patentable over Mason for the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, arguments, and remarks overcome all rejections. All remaining claims (Claims 16-36) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 16-36) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 8/12/2005

Jose S. Garcia

Jose S. Garcia
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060